REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search.

Claims 1 and 18 have been amended. Claims 47-48 have been newly added. No claims have been canceled. Hence, Claims 1-48 are pending in the present application.

Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed September 4, 2008 is addressed hereinafter.

I.   ISSUES RELATED TO THE CITED ART

A.   INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1 AND 18

Claim 1 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Abrams et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,675,350 ("ABRAMS") in view of Hofmann et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0009016 ("HOFMANN") and further in view of Griffin, U.S. Patent No. 7,367,014 ("GRIFFIN"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

1.   GRIFFIN does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 1 of generating and storing a mapping that maps one or more page parameters to one or more portlet parameters, where the mapping is stored separate from pages associated with the one or more page parameters.

Among other features, Claim 1 comprises:

generating and storing a mapping that maps one or more page parameters to one or more portlet parameters, wherein the mapping is stored separate from pages associated with the one or more page parameters.

The Office Action asserts that this feature of Claim 1 is described in GRIFFIN. This assertion is incorrect.

GRIFFIN describes a mechanism for representing portlet configuration information as an XML document. (See GRIFFIN, col. 1, lines 50-53.) Specifically, GRIFFIN explains that a JSP page contains (1) traditional HTML and (2) embedded directives to invoke special

JSP processing (col. 4, lines 1-4). When such a JSP page is invoked by a client, the HTML

code from the page is processed and executed on the client. In contrast, code that is

explicitly identified by the directives within the JSP page is processed and executed on a web

server by the JSP engine (col. 4, lines 23-26).

GRIFFIN gives example code of a JSP page at col. 4, lines 6-16. As explained by

GRIFFIN, the directive "= new Date()" within the JSP page causes a new instance of the

Date class to be instantiated on a server. The new Date class produces a text string of that

indicates the current date. The text string thus produced is then sent to the client for display

as part of the JSP page.

In one of GRIFFIN's embodiments, when a client invokes a JSP page, a web server

compiles the page into a servlet and executes the servlet as a running process. A dynamic

output of the servlet is sent back to the client as a response. Processing of the JSP pages

within the web server may also result in the inclusion and invocation of other JSP files. (See

GRIFFIN, col. 4, lines 30-37.)

Significantly, however, nothing in GRIFFIN describes or suggests a mapping

between page parameters and portlet parameters that is stored separate from pages associated

with the page parameters, as featured in Claim 1. Rather, since GRIFFIN describes invoking

JSP pages **using embedded directives**, there is <u>no</u> need for generating a <u>mapping</u> between

page parameters and portlet parameters because the portal pages that include the directives

<u>expressly identify</u> and <u>point to</u> the JSP pages that need to be invoked. See, for example,

GRIFFIN, Fig. 2 and col. 3, lines 13-14 (title bar identifies the portlet) and col. 3, lines 38-41

(directive to initiate portlet execution in HTML table cells on the portal page).

To the extent that the JSP pages that are invoked from a portlet page require

input parameters, values for those input parameters would be specified in the directives

embedded in the portlet pages themselves. Because the parameter values would be specified in the directives embedded in the portlet page, the portlet page would not need "page parameters", and there would be no need to have a mapping between page parameters and input parameters of the JSP pages.

In contrast, Claim 1 expressly requires generating and storing a mapping that <u>maps</u> one or more <u>page</u> **parameters** to one or more <u>portlet</u> **parameters**, where the mapping is stored separate from pages associated with the one or more page parameters. Since, as discussed above, a portal page in GRIFFIN expressly identifies the JSP pages it needs to invoke, GRIFFIN does not describe and does not even need a mapping that maps page <u>parameters</u> to portlet <u>parameters</u>. Further, the passages from GRIFFIN cited in the Office Action (namely col. 3, lines 1-9 and col. 11, lines 1-24) for this feature of Claim 1 do not describe any mapping.

For example, in col. 3, lines 1-9, GRIFFIN describes that portlets could display information such as stock prices, where a user may be able to configure such portlets to display only stocks of interest. In some embodiment, the user could select a given stock displayed in a portlet, and receive more detailed information. Significantly, however, as shown in Fig. 1 of GRIFFIN, a portal page has fixed regions or frames that each identifies a separate portlet associated with a different stock exchange. Thus, since the portal page expressly identifies the portlet, there is no need to map page parameters to portlet parameters. Further, GRIFFIN expressly states that a user <u>selects</u> a given stock displayed **in** the portlet (col. 3, lines 4-5), which suggests that the portlet <u>itself</u> (and not the page!) may provide an element (e.g., a text box, a list box, etc.) that can accept user input. Hence, there is no need for a mapping of a <u>page</u> parameter to a portlet parameter.

Col. 11, lines 1-24 recite portions of GRIFFIN's claim 21. These claim portions recite: an XML schema for validating an XML document; a server receiving a request to render a portal page from a client; the server compiling one or more resources to spawn a hierarchy of rendering processes; and the server generating the portal page by executing the rendering processes. There is absolutely nothing in this passage of GRIFFIN that describes or suggests a mapping that maps page parameters to portlet parameters, such as the mapping featured in Claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, GRIFFIN does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim1 of a mapping that maps one or more page parameters to one or more portlet parameters, where the mapping is stored separate from pages associated with the one or more page parameters

      2.   <u>ABRAMS does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 1 of retrieving and inspecting the mapping to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter of a portlet that generates a component of the page that is based, at least in part, on the portlet parameter.</u>

Among other features, Claim 1 requires:

      retrieving and inspecting the mapping to determine that the page parameter is mapped to a portlet parameter of a portlet that generates a component of the page that is based, at least in part, on the portlet parameter.

The Office Action asserts that this feature of Claim 1 is described in ABRAMS. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that input entered by a user in the graphical user interface (GUI) of ABRAMS' Figs. 2A and 2B corresponds to the page parameters of Claim 1, and that the tabbed display area 630 in ABRAMS' Fig. 6 corresponds to the portlet of Claim 1. These assertions are incorrect.

As a preliminary matter, it is noted that the GUI display areas of ABRAMS' Figs. 2A,

2B, and 6 are not pages. Rather, these GUI display areas are generated by an application

program (tool) that provides an HTML parser. (See ABRAMS, col. 3, lines 48-53.) Thus,

even if one is to consider that the GUI of ABRAMS' application tool may somehow

correspond to a "page", the GUI and any input provided by the user into such GUI would be

processed internally <u>within</u> the execution code of the application tool. In contrast, Claim 1

features a mapping that is stored <u>separate</u> from pages associated with the one or more page

parameters.

Further, in col. 4, lines 13-30 and with respect to its Figs. 2A and 2B, ABRAMS

describes panes 240, 250, and 260 of a GUI display window 210. (See also col. 4, lines 4-5.)

Pane 240 displays a web page as it would be viewed in a browser, pane 250 displays the

HTML source of the same web page, and pane 260 displays the headlines retrieved by

ABRAMS' application tool from that web page. When a user selects a web address in pane

220 of the GUI, the application tool displays in pane 260 all hyperlinks of the site indicated

by the web address. In col. 6, lines 12-25, ABRAMS describes that the application tool may

generate HTML code which positions headlines on a page in accordance with a user-defined

display structure. This user-defined display structure may or may not have any connection to

the web sites used for generating site summaries, and as a result the application tool of

ABRAMS creates a customized portal view that consists of the headlines selected from the

web sites.

Significantly, however, the above passages of ABRAMS do not describe or suggest

that a <u>mapping</u> between page parameters and portlet parameters is inspected during the

processing of the user input by the application tool. In contrast, Claim 1 comprises the

feature of retrieving and inspecting the mapping to determine that the page parameter is

mapped to a portlet parameter of a portlet that generates a component of the page that is based, at least in part, on the portlet parameter. It is quite clear that ABRAMS' standalone application tool, along with its GUI and the display areas therein, does not perform and does not even need to perform any functionalities that correspond to this feature of Claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, ABRAMS, GRIFFIN, and HOFMANN do not describe or suggest all features of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN and further in view of GRIFFIN. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

B.   INDEPENDENT CLAIM 18

Claim 18 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN and further in view of GRIFFIN. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

1.   GRIFFIN does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 18 of generating and storing a first mapping that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters, wherein the first mapping is stored separate from pages associated with the one or more page parameters.

Among other features, Claim 18 requires:

generating and storing a first mapping that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters, wherein the first mapping is stored separate from pages associated with the one or more page parameters.

The Office Action asserts that this feature of Claim 1 is described in Fig. 6 and col. 2, lines 45-59 of GRIFFIN. This assertion is incorrect.

As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, GRIFFIN does not describe or suggest any mappings that involve page parameters. Rather, since GRIFFIN describes portal pages that invoke JSP pages on a web server, there is <u>no</u> need for generating a <u>mapping</u> that involves page parameters because the portal pages being rendered <u>expressly identify</u> and <u>point to</u> the JSP pages that need to be invoked.

Further, in p. 11, second paragraph, the Office Action asserts that: (1) "mouse movements/gestures" that are registered for a portal page correspond to event parameters that are mapped to page parameters; and (2) minimizing and maximizing a portlet window correspond to actions that are mapped to events. These assertions are incorrect.

It is respectfully noted that GRIFFIN does not even mention the terms "mapping", "event" and "action", let alone describe a mapping that maps events to actions and event output parameters to page parameters, such as the first mapping featured in Claim 18.

Further, in col. 2, lines 45-59 GRIFFIN describes that portal pages can be thought of as panes that can be swapped into and out of a portal page. A selection of portal element can be accomplished with an input device such as a mouse, a motion detector, a voice command, a hand or eye gesture, etc. Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, however, neither this passage nor any other passage of GRIFFIN describes that "mouse movements/gestures" are <u>registered</u> anywhere for a portal page. Even more importantly, GRIFFIN does <u>not</u> describe or even remotely suggest that a <u>mapping</u> is generated that maps mouse movements to particular actions (such as the window minimizing and maximizing asserted in the Office Action), or that the output <u>parameters</u> of the mouse movements are mapped to page parameters.

In contrast, Claim 18 comprises the feature of generating and storing a first <u>mapping</u> that <u>maps</u> one or more <u>events</u> <u>to</u> one or more <u>actions</u> <u>and</u> one or more <u>event output</u>

parameters <u>to</u> one or more <u>page parameters</u>, where the first mapping is stored separate from pages associated with the one or more page parameters. For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that GRIFFIN does not describe or suggest this feature of Claim 18.

    2.   <u>ABRAMS does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 18 of determining, based on the first mapping and the passed data, an action to perform in response to the particular event.</u>

Among other features, Claim 18 comprises:

determining, based on the first mapping and the passed data, an action to perform in response to the particular event.

The Office Action asserts that this feature of Claim 18 is described in col. 4, lines 21-24 of ABRAMS. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that the action performed in ABRAMS is to display in pane 260 all hyperlinks with their associated text for the selected web site. This assertion is incorrect.

As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, ABRAMS does not describe any mapping that involves page parameters and that is separate from the pages associated with the page parameters. Rather, the GUI display areas and panes in Figs. 2A, 2B, and 6 of ABRAMS are generated by an application program (tool) that provides an HTML parser. (See ABRAMS, col. 3, lines 48-53.) Thus, even if one is to consider that the GUI and the panes therein (such as pane 260) of ABRAMS' application tool may somehow correspond to a "page", the GUI and any input provided by the user into such GUI would be processed internally <u>within</u> the execution code of the application tool. In contrast, Claim 18 features a first mapping that is stored <u>separate</u> from pages associated with the one or more page parameters.

Further, in col. 4, lines 21-24 ABRAMS describes that when a user selects a web address in pane 220 of the GUI, the application tool displays in pane 260 all hyperlinks of the site indicated by the web address. This, however, does not describe or even suggest that any determination is made <u>based on</u> a <u>mapping</u> that maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters.

In contrast, Claim 18 includes the feature of determining, based on the first mapping and the passed data, an action to perform in response to the particular event. For the foregoing reason, it is respectfully submitted that ABRAMS does not describe or suggest this feature of Claim 18.

3. <u>ABRAMS does not describe or suggest the feature of Claim 18 of inspecting the first mapping to determine that an event output parameter associated with the particular event is mapped to a page parameter.</u>

Among other features, Claim 18 comprises:

inspecting the first mapping to determine that an event output parameter associated with the particular event is mapped to a page parameter.

The Office Action asserts that this feature of Claim 18 is described in col. 4, lines 21-29 of ABRAMS. This assertion is incorrect.

As discussed above with respect to Claim 1, in col. 4, lines 21-30 and with respect to its Figs. 2A and 2B, ABRAMS describes that when a user selects a web address in pane 220 of the GUI, the application tool displays in pane 260 all hyperlinks of the site indicated by the web address.

Significantly, however, neither the above passage nor any other passages of ABRAMS describe or suggest that any <u>mapping</u> is inspected, where the mapping maps one or more events to one or more actions and one or more event output parameters to one or

more page parameters. In other words, ABRAMS does not describe or even suggest that any

mapping is inspected to determine whether a parameter of an event caused by user input is

mapped to any GUI parameter.

In contrast, Claim 18 includes the feature of inspecting the first mapping to

determine that an event output parameter associated with the particular event is mapped to a

page parameter, where the first mapping maps one or more events to one or more actions and

one or more event output parameters to one or more page parameters.

For the foregoing reasons, ABRAMS GRIFFIN and HOFMANN do not describe or

suggest all features of Claim 18. Thus, Claim 18 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over

ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN and further in view of GRIFFIN. Reconsideration and

withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 18 is respectfully requested.

C.   DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-17 AND 19-46

Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 were rejected as

allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN and

further in view of GRIFFIN. Claims 4, 6, 27, and 29 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN further in view of

GRIFFIN and further in view of Hind et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US

2004/0205555 ("HIND"). Claims 9-12 and 32-35 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN further in view of

GRIFFIN further in view of HIND and further in view of Burnard et al., U.S. Patent No.

5,613,122 ("BURNARD"). Claims 15 and 38 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of HOFMANN further in view of GRIFFIN and

further in view of Katariya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,564,251 ("KATARIYA").

Each of Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 depends directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1 and 18, and thus includes each and every feature of the independent base claim. Furthermore, in rejecting Claims 4, 6, 9-12, 15, 27, 29, 32-35, and 38 the Office Action relies explicitly on ABRAMS, GRIFFIN, and HOFMANN, and not on HIND, BURNARD or KATARIYA, to show the features discussed above with respect to Claims 1 and 18. Because ABRAMS does not teach the subject matter of Claims 1 and 18, any combination of ABRAMS, GRIFFIN, and HOFMANN with the other three references necessarily fails to teach the complete combination recited in any dependent claim of Claims 1 or 18. Thus, each of Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 is allowable for the reasons given above for Claims 1 and 18.

In addition, each of Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 introduces one or more additional features that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 1 and 18. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-26, 28, 30-31, 36-37, and 39-46 is respectfully requested.

D.   NEW CLAIMS 47-48

Each of new Claims 47-48 depends directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1 and thus includes each and every feature of the independent base claim. Thus, each of Claims 47-48 is allowable for at least the reasons given above for Claim 1. In addition, each of Claims 47-48 introduces one or more additional features that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the

positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 47-48 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. Consideration and allowance of Claims 47-48 is respectfully requested.

II.   CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed. Further, for the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a law firms check for the petition for extension of time fee is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: December 4, 2008   /StoychoDDraganoff#56181/

Stoycho D. Draganoff
Reg. No. 56,181

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California   95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 208
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076